DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 578 FL 010 670

AUTHOR Katz, Joel T.
TITLE Foreigner Talk Input in Child Second Language Acquisition: Its Form and Function over Time.
PUB DATE Jun 77
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum (1st, Los Angeles, California, February 11-13, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Language; Discourse Analysis; English (Second Language); *Language Development; *Language Patterns; *Language Processing; Language Research; Language Usage; *Language Variation; Learning Processes; Learning Theories; Linguistic Theory; Morphology (Languages); Phonology; Psycholinguistics; *Second Language Learning; Speech Communication; Syntax
IDENTIFIERS *Foreigner Talk

ABSTRACT

Part of a study is presented of native speakers of Hebrew who are acquiring English without formal instruction. A Hebrew-speaking child, aged 5 years 6 months, and her American playmate were audiotaped bi-weekly in natural settings for 11 months. The American child periodically used "foreigner talk," that is, the variety of language regarded as appropriate for addressing foreigners who are trying to learn the language of the host country. Monthly samples of this foreigner talk (FT) were excerpted from the transcripts. Given the longitudinal nature of such data, the following questions were chosen for study: (1) the prevalence and consistency of the American's FT; (2) the phonological and morphosyntactic features marking the FT; (3) the nature of the relationship between the FT and the Hebrew-speaker's emerging English; and (4) occasions when the American used FT. It was found that the presence of FT was relatively low and fairly constant and that the phonological and morphosyntactic features that comprise the FT behaved distinctly over time. As to the nature of the relationship between the American's FT and the foreigner's emerging English L2, the two systems change over time but independently of each other. A comparison of the results with data in other studies concludes the report. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Foreigner Talk Input in Child Second Language Acquisition: its Form and Function over Time[1]

Joel T. Katz
Stanford University Linguistics

ED176579

Man may be a born talker but he is not born talking. From the verbal sea surrounding him the neonate must discover the relevant units of his language and their combinatorial properties. Vocabulary aside, this remarkable feat is substantially completed by the end of the fifth year.[2] In view of the supposedly (emphasis: JTK) fragmentary and degenerate nature of the child's input data, Chomsky (1965: 58) feels that there is "little hope that much of the language can be learned by an organism initially uninformed as to its general character." The child's task as language learner may be considerably easier than Chomsky had surmised, however. Recent empirical investigations have demonstrated that parents' speech to children is systematically slower, shorter in utterance length, less syntactically complex, more grammatical, more fluent, and more redundant (cf. Andersen 1976). As such, this parent-to-child speech register is distinctly different from the language adults use to each other.

Shatz and Gelman (1973) and Sachs and Devin (1976) have shown that children themselves as young as four years old are able to adjust their speech as a function of the age of the addressee: in general, while language directed towards younger listeners showed changes in MLU, question type, verb tense, and other features, age-peer listeners were treated like adult listeners (no modifications). Shatz and Gelman interpret the results as an indication that speech directed to a listener is differentially affected by what the (child-)speaker perceives the language ability of that listener to be, rather than by the listener's age.

Now what modifications, if any, would occur if an age-peer were seen by the speaker as possessing inferior language ability? This situation is a potential site for the speech register described as FOREIGNER TALK (Andersen 1977; Ferguson 1975a,b; Ferguson and DeBose 1976; Hatch, Shapira and Gough 1975): the variety of language regarded as appropriate for addressing foreigners who are trying to learn the language of the host country. The following (from Hatch 1976) are examples of adult-to-adult foreigner talk used by an instructor in an adult school:

> In your house. You...house. A tub. You [gestures] wash. (explaining the meaning of "bath" and "to bathe")
>
> I want speak other person. He not here. What good thing for say now? (explaining how to take telephone messages)
>
> Not other student listen. I no want. Necessary you speak. Maybe I say, "What is your name?" The writing not important. (explaining interviews)
>
> The book. We have... [holds up copy of textbook] book. Is necessary for class. Right? Necessary for class. You have book? (reminding students to bring books to class)

FL010670

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Carol Kreuzig
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

In the present study data have been examined from longitudinal research (October 1975 through August 1976) on two native speakers of Modern Israeli Hebrew who are acquiring English without formal instruction. The children, who were audiotaped bi-weekly in natural settings, had no previous exposure to English. One of them, a girl I will call Tamar, was age 5;6 when the study began. Her favorite American playmate, an age-peer whom I will call Lisa, periodically used foreigner talk when addressing Tamar. Monthly samples of this foreigner talk (henceforth "FT") were excerpted from the transcripts. Given the longitudinal nature of such data, the following questions are of interest: (i) How prevalent is Lisa's FT to Tamar and how consistently is it used over time? (ii) What phonological and morphosyntactic features mark this FT and what might account for their distribution? (iii) Can the relationship between Lisa's FT and Tamar's emerging English be called "parasitic?" Perhaps the FT guides Tamar's English or Tamar's English determines the course of Lisa's FT. (iv) Alternatively, can the relationship between Lisa's FT and Tamar's developing English be called "symbiotic?" Maybe the FT and Tamar's English <u>each</u> affect the other. (v) In addressing the question, "When does Lisa use FT?" we might take a linguistic approach and investigate whether something in Tamar's speech triggers Lisa's FT (what I will later call "weak" contingency) or whether a <u>particular</u> structure in Tamar's speech triggers the <u>same</u> structure in Lisa's FT (what I will call "strong" contingency). On the other hand, we might take a speech-act approach (Austin 1962; Halliday 1975; Searle 1970, 1975) and investigate whether Lisa uses more FT in certain communicative contexts than in others (say, more in clarifications and directives than in object naming or describing an ongoing activity).

****

First, how prevalent is Lisa's use of FT? Table #1 charts the approximately monthly sessions which were excerpted from the transcripts.[3] Lisa uses FT a relatively small percent of the time, even if we adjust the figures by eliminating from the tally those utterances where Lisa simply calls Tamar's name: "Tamar." Second, the percentage of FT varies within a relatively limited range: 2-19% (or 9-19% if we disregard sessions 7, 8 and 9 which contain markedly fewer utterances overall).

Next, what features mark Lisa's FT to Tamar? These are listed in Table #2 as being either phonological or morphosyntactic in character.[4] The two categories turn out to behave differently over time. In general, the amount of phonological features within a given session increases while the amount of morphosyntactic features decreases.

I found this pattern surprising at first, for the following reason. Suppose someone were parachuted into Africa and met a Zulu speaker, whom he could not understand. While the visitor would probably not

be able to segment a stretch of Zulu into words, phrases and sentences, he would be able to detect aspects of Zulu that were phonologically different from English and that had a tendency to recur. In the same way, perhaps the most striking aspect of a foreigner's English is its phonological character, the "foreign accent." As the native speaker gets accustomed over time to the foreigner's second-language (henceforth "L2") output, the native speaker eventually becomes aware that besides phonological peculiarities, there are structural, morphosyntactic deviations from the L2 target, such as the foreigner's variable use of the English article and copula. On this account, the phonological features of the foreigner's L2 would recede from aural prominence over time; in contrast, the morphosyntactic character of the L2 output would become increasingly noticeable. To the extent that FT is imitative of foreigner's approximations to an L2 target, this pattern would be mirrored in the native speaker's FT. Phonological FT markers would decline over time or at least remain constant. Call this Hypothesis 1, the Saliency Hypothesis. Obviously, Lisa's data do not fit this hypothesis. (I shall return later to the question of whether FT is imitative of foreigners' L2 output.)

Alternatively, one might propose a Skill Hypothesis: the more you practice an activity, the better you get. If phonological features are the primary marker of FT register, we would expect phonological features to increase over time as Lisa becomes more proficient in using FT. Clearly, FT has to be learned since it is not obvious a priori what characteristics would mark such a register. While this hypothesis, Hypothesis 2, accounts for the rise in Lisa's use of phonological features, it presupposes a functional split: phonological features simply mark FT as the register in use at the time, distinct from other registers, while morphosyntactic features do something else. One possibility for the "something else" is that morphosyntactic features are either pedagogically motivated -- L2 target patterns are modeled in overt, if not correct, ways -- or else morphosyntactic features occur when one is clarifying a misunderstanding or repairing a communicative breakdown. But this dichotomy is overly simplistic. First of all, few of Lisa's FT utterances are marked solely by phonological or solely by morphosyntactic features. Indeed, since most FT utterances are marked by both kinds of features, it is difficult to interpret the utterance's communicative purpose (say, clarification) as residing only in the morphosyntax. Secondly, Lisa's FT utterances serve various other purposes besides being merely pedagogical or repairing communicative disruption. The multiplicity of Lisa's speech act types militates against a simple functional split between phonological and morphosyntactic features.

Let us consider an intermediate position, Hypothesis 3. The L2 learner's morphosyntax will gradually improve over time, yet his non-native phonology will persist, perhaps becoming more apparent in comparison to the morphosyntax. If FT is sensitive to the shape of the L2 learner's output, then the FT should reflect these facts: morphosyntactic features should decline over time,

yet phonological features should remain at the same level or even increase. This would explain the shape of Lisa's data without the complications of Hypothesis 2.

Another interesting point about the data is that the most prevalent phonological features are highly specific, low-level phenomena: monophthongization of dipthongs, vowel de-tensing, the vowel shift æ → ɛ, and initial unaspirated stops. More global features such as slower tempo, careful enunciation and syllable-timed utterances -- features a linguist might assume to characterize a FT register -- are surprisingly sparse in the data. The same situation holds for morphosyntactic features. Those reported by others to mark FT (as well as Baby Talk: Ferguson 1975a,c) are very infrequent here: simplified negation (NEG → no(t)) and deletion of grammatical morphemes like the article, copula, and auxiliary-be.

Now while the incidence of morphosyntactic features in Lisa's FT is declining over time, the different kinds of morphosyntactic features become progressively more varied. After the initial sessions the morphosyntactic features show greater variety than the phonological features, although both kinds of features generally increase over time. I will return to this finding in discussing the communicative functions of Lisa's FT.

We might inquire as to whether the frequently-occurring features that mark Lisa's FT are also found in the same proportion in Lisa's non-FT speech. That is, does the prevalence of one-word utterances and their repetitions, phrasal repetitions, syntactic expansions and reductions, and intonation questions in Lisa's FT automatically follow from the prevalence of these categories in Lisa's speech in general? When FT versus non-FT instances of these categories are compared, no correlation reaches significance at the (two-tailed) 5% level.

Therefore, the preponderence of certain morphosyntactic characteristics does not follow from the distribution of these features in Lisa's speech in general, which is another way of saying that Lisa's FT register is distinct from her normal speech to Tamar and to the investigator.

Having discussed the prevalence, consistency, and composition of Lisa's FT, let us turn to the question of relationship. Is the link between the FT and Tamar's English L2 parasitic or symbiotic? A parasitic relationship would involve either Lisa's FT changing in response to Tamar's English L2 or Tamar's English L2 changing in response to Lisa's FT. A symbiotic relationship would involve both the former and the latter.

Six specific features were examined in Lisa's FT and Tamar's English L2 within each session: simplified negation, the absence

of articles in obligatory contexts, the absence of -s on plural nouns and third-person singular verbs, the absence of the copula, and the use of accusative pronominal subjects (as in, "Me see the microphone"). These particular morphosyntactic features were chosen because they have been investigated by other first and second-language researchers (e.g., Brown 1973, Dulay and Burt 1974, Hakuta 1975, Rosansky 1976). Each of the six features occured in Lisa's FT at least three times and in at least three sessions. For each feature, the percentage of correct use in obligatory contexts was plotted over time. There turned out to be no significant correlation at the (two-tailed) 5% level for Tamar's English L2 versus Lisa's FT.

It would appear that (a) Lisa's FT is not changing in response to Tamar's developing English L2 and that (b) Tamar's improving English L2 is not changing in response to Lisa's FT input. This is at least true at a global level. However, approximately one month's time separates each of the ten sessions. What is unknown is the interplay between Tamar's L2 curve and Lisa's FT curve within each session. Although the local facts about parasitic and symbiotic relationships are still under analysis, one plausible outcome is the following. If there is any adjustment of Lisa's FT to Tamar's English L2, such adjustment within a given session should take place more quickly in later sessions than in earlier sessions. This more rapid response time for the engagement of FT may be the product of Lisa's increasing awareness of just what constitutes a FT register. In a sense, I am salvaging the spirit of the Skill Hypothesis described above. On the other hand, Lisa might introduce FT at a later point in time within a given session as we look at her later taping sessions, since there would be less need to use FT as Tamar's English L2 improves.

One aspect of Lisa's FT for which I do have data is contingency. Recall that this is one way of answering the question, "When does Lisa use FT?" Is there something structural in Tamar's speech that triggers Lisa's use of FT? One possibility is that when Tamar uses Hebrew or uses English with missing copulas, articles, etc., this triggers FT in Lisa. Call this "weak" contingency since in these cases Lisa does not incorporate Tamar's English "defect" into the FT. The amount of triggering, if at all present, is extremely low.

"Strong" contingency, in contrast, occurs when Tamar triggers FT in Lisa such that a particular word, phrase or structure (say, missing copula) in Tamar's speech is incorporated into Lisa's FT. The only outstanding effect here is the decline of word as a category of incorporation. Also, words are incorporated into Lisa's FT more often than phrases.

I have been speaking of Tamar's speech triggering Lisa's FT. Does the converse effect occur? What is the extent to which a particular word, phrase, or structure in Tamar's FT is immediately incorporated into Tamar's next utterance? (Here, word, phrase and structure are categories of strong contingency.) Again, the percentage of Lisa's FT episodes in which either kind of contingency holds is quite low. Also, the amount of word incorporation is once more generally higher than the amount of phrase incorporation. The important pattern across time is that the percentage of structural incorporation into Tamar's speech initially increases but quickly flattens out. This is understandable: Tamar is less likely to incorporate morphosyntactic features from Lisa's FT as her own morphology and syntax improve.

Note that in speaking of contingency, we have not established that the presence of X is a causal explanation for the appearance of Y. We have merely noted that X and Y are temporally contiguous in certain linguistic settings.

Let us tackle the question, "When does Lisa use FT?" from a different perspective: In what communicative situations does Lisa address FT to Tamar? I have coded each of Lisa's FT utterances as performing a particular communicative function, and these functions are listed in Table #5. The individual types of speech acts are subsumed under several broad categories. Their frequency within each session is displayed in Table #6.

Sessions 7, 8 and 9 are asterisked; recall from Table #1 that these sessions contain a markedly smaller number of Lisa's FT utterances and total utterances than do the other sessions. The figures in these asterisked columns should be considered with caution. Also, the percentages in each session's column may not tally to 100% due to rounding.

Let us examine each broad category over time. IMITATION shows a general decrease from an initially high level. This is probably because over time Lisa discovers that a FT register can be used for other functions besides picking up on features of Tamar's English L2 or modeling the pronunciation of certain English words. The category DESCRIPTION starts off at a high level of use and flattens to a lower general level of use. As Tamar's proficiency in English grows, there is less necessity for Lisa to use FT for such identification purposes as naming objects, describing past/present/future actions and states, or indicating deictically here/there, this/that. The category CONVERSATIONAL GLUE, on the other hand, shows a general increasing trend. As Tamar's English L2 develops, Lisa needs to be less concerned about the information-exchange aspect of discourse (object naming, locating, describing) and can use FT to sustain the continuity of conversation through the use of such things as greetings, "OK," and attention-getting vocatives.

The next broad functional category relates to this point more clearly. Expressions of SELF -- allotment of game turns or conversational turns, suggestions, directives and requests, (dis)agreement, and statements of intent -- can be encoded in FT more frequently over time since, as Tamar's communicative competence in English L2 grows (especially Tamar's comprehension), matters of object reference or the apprehending of a certain state of affairs do not need to be checked so frequently. That is not to say that clarification episodes and Lisa's asking of information questions occur progressively less often; this is obvious from the frequency profile of the category FEEDBACK. Note how a graph of the FEEDBACK percentages would bob up and down across time. This bobbing pattern makes sense if one takes the position that information questions and clarifications are highly situation-dependent. There is no overall tendency for the FEEDBACK percentages to decrease over time. (This would have indicated that Lisa and Tamar progressively improve in their ability to communicate with one another.) Neither do the FEEDBACK figures increase over time. (Lisa would ask Tamar more information questions or would demand more clarification from Tamar since Tamar would be increasingly able to respond in English L2.)

An alternative way of looking at the overall functional categories is to rank-order them within each session and examine the interrelationships over time. This is done in Table #7. DESCRIPTION appears most frequently in the first two sessions, but does not occupy a high rank-order position subsequently. Likewise, IMITATION is ranked second in session 1, but thereafter hovers around the bottom of the list. The category SELF comes to the fore in session 3, and maintains this position to the end. GLUE seems to fit into the vacant slot within each session, and I have nothing more interesting to say about this. The category FEEDBACK stays relatively high for the middle sessions, 2 through 7. However, the inherent nature of rank-ordering obscures the distance between the items under comparison. We have no way of telling that the FEEDBACK percentages for the middle sessions range from 6% to 30%.

Finally I plotted type-to-token ratios across sessions, this time for the diversity of functional categories expressed by Lisa's FT. There is a slight increasing trend in diversity. Recall that, while the use of morphosyntactic features declined across sessions, the diversity of the morphosyntactic features employed increased. Perhaps this is due to the fact that there is an increase in the diversity of communicative functions that Lisa's FT performs.

****

Let us summarize what we know about Lisa's FT to Tamar. Its presence across sessions is relatively low and fairly constant. The phonological and morphosyntactic features that comprise the FT

register behave distinctly over time. The gradual decline of morphosyntactic features is perhaps linked to the improvement in Tamar's English L2 morphosyntax, but not in a direct way (Hypothesis 3). The concomitant rise in the diversity of morphosyntactic features may be due to the increase in communicative functions which FT serves. As to the nature of the relationship between Lisa's FT and Tamar's emerging English L2, the two systems change over time but independently of each other.

What conception of FT are the above facts consistent with?

Ferguson (1971:143-4 and especially 1975a:1-2) draws a distinction between how native speakers think foreigners use the host country's language and how foreigners actually speak the language. The independence over time of Lisa's FT from Tamar's L2 attests to this distinction. The fact that Lisa's FT appears at a fairly consistent low level of use (Table #1) suggests that Lisa is trying out FT because she is gradually learning what constitutes this register.[5]

More precisely, in the course of the eleven months of taping, Lisa forms a model of how foreigners sound when they attempt to speak English. I purposely use the word "model" -- a model of reality as it contrasts with reality itself. For Lisa at least, FT is not imitative, i.e., not a faithful replica of how foreigners do speak but rather how she thinks they speak. This is obvious from the following: Tamar's rampant mis-use of gender in English third person singular pronouns -- calling everything and everyone "she" -- was perhaps the most conspicuous aspect of her English L2 (see Katz 1976). Lisa often remarked that Tamar used she extensively and on several occasions asked Tamar why she indulged in such bizarre behavior. Yet not once did Lisa use overgeneralized she in her FT to Tamar.

One spin-off from this non-imitative view of FT is this: The earlier choice between the three hypotheses concerning the distribution of phonological and morphosyntactic FT-markers makes more sense. Remember that Hypothesis 3 was finally chosen, a hypothesis which correctly predicted, among other things, that the use of morphosyntactic features would decline over time. I sought to connect that fact with the increasing diversity of communicative functions that FT serves. Note that this motivation for an increase in morphosyntactic diversity -- trying out the speech act water, so to speak -- obviously need not be linked to structural properties of Tamar's English L2, if FT is not essentially imitative.

Ferguson and DeBose (1976:9-10) suggest that some modifications of speech in registers like FT are neither simplifying (remove redundancy), clarifying (add redundancy), nor more indicative of a standard form as opposed to a dialectal variant. Rather, such modifications "simply seem to signal attitudes or affect appropriate to the communicative situations. Thus, the proliferation of diminutive... formations in [Baby Talk] does not seem to make the language easier to process, but rather to express the speaker's attitude toward young children...In FT registers [such] expressive processes tend to mark the status and role relationships between the speakers...." Lisa's use of FT, then, may have served to mark the occasions on which she and Tamar were together as ones where a prototypical native speaker was socially engaged with a prototypical foreign speaker. This behavior is similar to the use of Thee and Thou in religious ceremonies, by which participants mark certain bits of social behavior as being religiou in nature rather than being dinner parties or football games.

In conclusion, this study is, to my knowledge, the first longitudinal approach to FT as a speech register and to the role of FT input in second language acquisition. The findings are quite preliminary, to be sure, but they suggest fruitful directions for research which I plan to explore in depth in the future.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

FOOTNOTES

(1) This is a revised version of the paper delivered at the First Annual Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum at UCLA, February 12, 1977. The author wishes to thank Eve Clark, Charles Ferguson and Elizabeth Traugott for their comments and suggestions.

(2) This is not to say that the process is totally completed. The acquisition of certain structures is evident from ages 5-10 (cf. Chomsky 1969. Cruttenden 1974, Ingram 1975) or even beyond (Moskowitz 1973).

(3) In scoring Tamar's and Lisa's speech, pauses and intonation contours were used in deciding what constituted a single utterance; in many cases the unit "utterance" was coextensive with the unit "sentence." If code-switching (English-Hebrew, Hebrew-English, or combinations thereof) occurred within what would otherwise be labeled a single utterance, the stretch of speech was counted as one utterance. In some cases the code-switching occurred at utterance boundaries, as defined by suprasegmental criteria. Any abrupt change of structure or thought was counted as a new utterance. Thus, the following example would be considered as two utterances: "You won't believe who I met at--what time is it now?"

(4) The term "prevalent item," denoted in Table #2 by double asterisks, means that the FT feature in question (i) is absent in no more than 3 of the 10 sessions, and (ii) appears in non-empty sessions with an average of at least 5 tokens. The actual non-empty means were 10.5 tokens for phonological features, 5.5 tokens for morphosyntactic features, and 7.0 tokens for both categories combined.

(5) Charles Ferguson (personal communication) points out that "learning" is not the most apt term. "Learning" implies increasing mastery in the direction of a standard, yet FT inherently has no standard form (I accept here the think versus actually distinction of Ferguson 1975a). A more appropriate description would be the one I turn to in the text: Lisa elaborates upon the current status of her FT; she expands her model of how she thinks foreigners speak.

* * * * * * * * *

REFERENCES

Andersen, Elaine S. (1976). Bibliography on language input to children. In C.E. Snow and C.A. Ferguson (eds.), Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition. London: Cambridge University Press.

Andersen, Elaine S. (1977). Learning to Speak with Style: a Study of the Sociolinguistic Skills of Children. Unpublished dissertation, Stanford University.

Austin, J.L. (1962). How to Do Things with Words (edited by J.O. Urmson). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Brown, Roger (1973). A First Language: the Early Stages. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Chomsky, Carol (1969). The Acquisition of Syntax in Children from 5 to 10. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam (1965). Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press.

Cruttenden, Alan (1974). An experiment involving comprehension of intonation in children from 7 to 10. Journal of Child Language 1:2, 221-231.

Dulay, Heidi and Marina Burt (1974). A new perspective on the creative construction process in child second language acquisition. Language Learning 24:1, 37-53.

Ferguson, Charles A. (1971). Absence of copula and the notion of simplicity: a study of normal speech, baby talk, foreigner talk, and pidgins. In Dell Hymes (ed.), Pidginization and Creolization of Languages. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ferguson, Charles A. (1975a). Towards a characterization of English foreigner talk. Anthropological Linguistics 17, 1-14.

Ferguson, Charles A. (1975b). Simplified registers, broken language and gastarbeiterdeutsch. To appear in C. Molony, H. Zobl and H. Stolling (eds.), Deutsch im Kontakt mit andern Sprachen. Kronberg/TS.: Scriptor Verlag.

Ferguson, Charles A. (1975c). Baby talk as simplified register. Stanford Papers and Reports in Child Language Development 9, 1-27.

Ferguson, Charles A. and Charles DeBose (1976) Simplified registers, broken language and pidginization. To appear in A. Valdman (ed.), Pidgin and Creole Linguistics. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Hakuta, Kenji (1975). Becoming Bilingual at Age Five: the Story of Uguisu. Unpublished Honors thesis, Harvard University.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1975). Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the Development of Language. London: Edward Arnold.

Hatch, Evelyn (1976). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. To appear in Evelyn Hatch (ed.), Second Language Acquisition: a Reader.

Hatch, E., R. Shapira and J. Gough (1975). "Foreigner-talk" discourse. Unpublished UCLA Working Paper in English as a Second Language.

Ingram, David (1975). If and when transformations are acquired by children. Georgetown University Roundtable in Linguistics 26, 99-127.

Katz, Joel T. (1976). Case, gender, and pronominal diamorphy in child second language acquisition. Paper delivered at First Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development, October 2, 197[illegible]

Moskowitz, Breyne Arlene (1973). On the status of the vowel shift in English. In Timothy E. Moore (ed.), Cognitive Development and the Acquisition of Language. New York: Academic Press.

Rosansky, Ellen J. (1976). Second Language Acquisition Research: a Question of Methods. Unpublished dissertation, Harvard University.

Sachs, Jaqueline and Judith Devin (1976). Young children's use of age-appropriate speech styles in social interaction and role-playing. Journal of Child Language 3:1, 81-98.

Searle, John R. (1970). Speech Acts: an Essay in the Philosophy of Language. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, John R. (1975). A taxonomy of illocutionary acts. In Keith Gunderson (ed.), Language, Mind and Knowledge. (Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, Volume #7.) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Shatz, Marilyn and Rochel Gelman (1973). The Development of Communication Skills: Modifications in the Speech of Young Children as a Function of Listener. Society for Research in Child Development monograph 38:5, #152.

ABLE #1: AMOUNT OF LISA'S FOREIGNER TALK BY SESSION

	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
# Lisa's total utt	505	581	505	646	501	472	198	219	240	625
% of FT utt	17	18	14	10	19	12	12	3	5	13
% of FT utt excluding "Tamar."	17	16	12	8	17	9	7	2	4	11

TABLE #2: FOREIGNER TALK FEATURES IN LISA'S SPEECH TO TAMAR (A REPRESENTATIVE LIST; ASTERISKED ITEMS ARE MOST PREVALENT[4])

PHONOLOGICAL FEATURES

r → {velar fricative: ɣ; tap: ɾ; trill: R} [bɛɣ] "bear"; [faɾi] "fairy"; kange [R] oo

ɚɹ$ → {ʌ, ə, ɵ, ʊ} hamm[ʌ] check[ə] board; tink[ɵ] toys; t[ʊ]n "turn"

r → {w, l, n} c[w]ayon [tɪɹcə] "Tirtzah" (girl's name); [nɛdɛ] "ready"

l → [-velarized] ("bright" l) [no...siL] "no, seal"

** Monophthongal diphthongs (same vowel height; no glide)

[yu] instead of [yuw] "you"

** Vowel de-tensing (vowel is laxed; no glide) [o k^h ɛ] "OK"

Vowel de-laxing (vowel is tensed; glides tallied under monophthongal diphthongs

[ðis] "this"

i ⟨y⟩ → e ⟨y⟩ [me] [se] "me; see"

** əl → ɛm [lɛm] "lamb"

De-schwa [lɛ́mə̀n] "lemon"

** Vowel overly nasalized [nõ] "no"

Glide → ø [θɛnkyu] "thank you"

TABLE #2, CONTINUED : PHONOLOGICAL AND MORPHOLOGICAL FOREIGNER TALK FEATURES

Epenthetic vowel — I want[ə] this. I want this.

#h→{ʔ , ø} — [ʔɔɹs] [ɛʔow] "horse; hello"

#t→ɡ — [ɡəmaɹ] "Tamar"

Consonant de-voicing — [pʊm] [æ̥nt] "boom; and"

** Initial non-aspirate stops — [kek] "cake"

Medial aspirate stops — [pɹɪ tʰi] "pretty"

Exaggerated intonation
Slower tempo
Syllable-timed utterances (not stress-timed)

MORPHOLOGICAL FEATURES

** One-word utterance
** One-word repetition
** Phrasal repetition: Me glue, me glue.

Bifurcation ("single thought" uncharacteristically split into two separated utterances)

I'm making something ... beautiful.

** Syntactic expansion: Six, nine. Six and nine.
** Syntactic reduction: OK, I'll give, give...

** Missing constituents: Push ø in?

** Accusative pronominal subjects: I'll give, give, me give, me give.

Simplified negation: {not, don't, didn't, won't} → NO(T)

Article → ø: Jumping over [a] hill. Look on [the] other side.
Preposition → ø: Tamar, listen ø me.
to-complementizer → ø: I want ø look.
Plural → ø: Two rock [s] ?
3rd singular → ø: Tamar get___ to have me Joker [card].
Copula be → ø: I ø 6½ too. (re: age)
Auxiliary be → ø: All right, let's see what we ø doing here.

** Intonation question (no overt syntactic marker of interrogation):
That's good ?

** Confirmation tags: "..... , {right, yeah, huh} ?"

TABLE #3: LISA'S FT VERSUS NON-FT OVER SESSIONS

Feature	Pearson r value (df=8)	
One-word utterances	0.35	p > 0.10
One-word repetitions	0.28	
Phrasal repetitions	0.07	
Syntactic expansions	-0.01	
Syntactic reductions	-0.16	
Intonation questions	0.43	

TABLE #4: LISA'S FT VERSUS TAMAR'S ENGLISH L2

Feature	Pearson r value	df	
Simplified negation	-0.24 *	6	asterisk denotes p > 0.10
Articles	-0.17 *	6	
Noun plural -s	0.03 *	2	
3rd singular -s	0.00	0	
Copula	0.32 *	8	
Accusative subjects	0.51 *	8	

TABLE #5

Communicative function of Lisa's FT utterances

IMITATION: Pick up on a word in Tamar's speech
Pronunciation lesson
Imitate Tamar's pronunciation
Use a foreign accent other than Tamar's
Sing a song in FT register

FEEDBACK: Clarification episodes (Lisa demands/provides clarification)
Information question (yes-no, WH)

DESCRIPTION: of current states, events, objects
of past...
of future...
Object naming
Deixis (here/there, this/that)

CONVERSATIONAL "GLUE": Phatic ("Hello," "Goodbye," "How are you?")
Response ("OK")
Vocative/attention-getter ("Hey," "Tamar")

Expression of SELF-intent or attitude:
Regulative (e.g., alloting turns)
Suggestions
Directives/requests
Rejections
Statements of Lisa's intent
Opinions
Agreement
Contra (disagreement or stating the opposite view)

MULTIPLE CATEGORIZATION

UNCLASSIFIABLE

TABLE #6:

% of FP episodes within each session, by communicative category

	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7*	S8*	S9*	S10
IMITATION	19	12	10	2	4	7	6	--	8	5
FEEDBACK	6	16	18	17	27	6	30	--	--	14
DESCRIPTION	38	35	14	5	11	10	12	--	--	17
"GLUE"	6	11	15	8	8	21	12	--	23	18
SELF	17	16	26	46	37	42	30	1 00	46	32
MULT. CAT.	12	8	6	18	6	5	--	--	--	3
UNCLASSIFIABLE	3	1	7	2	7	9	12	--	23	1

TABLE #7:

Rank-ordering of communicative categories within each session

S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7*	S8*	S9*	S10
desc	desc	self	self	self	self	{self, feed}	self	self	self
imit	{feed, self}	feed	feed	feed	glue			glue	glue
self		glue		desc	desc			imit	desc
{feed, glue}	imit	desc	{glue, desc}	glue	imit	desc			feed
	glue	imit		imit	feed	glue			imit
			imit			imit			